



45(b)(1)); Parker v. Doe, No. 02-7215, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23498, at \*6 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 21, 2002). It is undisputed that Plaintiffs did not effect personal service on these witnesses. Rather, the subpoenas were “left [with] Shirley.” (Doc. No. 189-2.) As such, service of the subpoenas was defective. Further, Plaintiffs’ motion to compel Defendants to effect service on the witnesses in question must also fail. The Court finds no basis in law, and Plaintiffs identify none, justifying an order deputizing Defendants as Plaintiffs’ process server.

**ACCORDINGLY**, on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of April 2011, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ motion to compel (Doc. No. 189) is **DENIED**.

S/ Yvette Kane  
Yvette Kane, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania